

REMARKS

Claims 1-44 are pending in the instant application. Claims 1-44 are rejected. No claims are amended herein.

102 Rejections

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 11-13, 15-16, 22-24, 26-27, 33-35, 37-38 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Alpert (U.S. Patent No. 6,405,226). The Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the Applicants' invention as are recited in Claims 1-2, 4-5, 11-13, 15-16, 22-24, 26-27, 33-35, 37-38 and 44 are neither shown nor suggested by Alpert et al.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 1 which sets forth that an embodiment of the present invention includes a method for user review and validation of content comprising the steps of:

...displaying said content; and displaying an indication of a state of a user's validation of said content, wherein said state of said user's validation of said content corresponds to: content not reviewed by user, use with caution; or content reviewed by user with a positive validation; or content reviewed by user with a negative validation.

Independent Claims 12, 23 and 34 recite limitations similar to those found in Claim 1. Claims 2, 4-5 and 11 depend from Claim 1, Claims 13, 15-16, 22, 35 and 37-38 depend from Claim 12, Claims 24, 26, 27 and 33 depend from Claim 23 and Claim 44 depends from Claim 34. These claims recite further features of the claimed invention.

Alpert et al. does not anticipate or render obvious a method for user review and validation of content that includes displaying an indication of the status of a user's review and validation of the content that includes "content not reviewed by user, use with caution; or content reviewed by user with a positive validation; or content reviewed by user with a negative validation" as is recited in Claim 1 (Claims 12, 23 and 34 contain similar limitations). In order to meet the aforementioned limitation of Claim 1 a reference must show or suggest, either expressly or inherently, along with the other limitations set forth in the Claims: (1) the display of an indication of a user's validation of content; and (2) an indication of the status of a user's review.

The Alpert et al. reference does not show or suggest these claim limitations. Alpert et al. only shows a system and method for taggable digital portfolio creation and report generation. As such, Alpert et al. is primarily concerned with the provision of comments that merely characterize data. Alpert et al. does not teach or suggest that a user positively indicate whether or not the user has reviewed the content. More specifically, the embodiments of the Applicants' invention as set forth in the Claims 1, 12, 23 and 34 feature user provided validations that not only characterize data ("positive validation", "negative validation" etc.) but also characterize the status of a user's review ("not reviewed", "reviewed") of the data. Moreover, the claims expressly set forth that the characterizations that are made are displayed to the end user. Nowhere in the Alpert et al. reference is there taught or suggested a system or method for user review and validation of content that includes displaying an indication of the state of a user's validation of the content where the state of the validation of

the content corresponds to “content not reviewed by user, use with caution; or content reviewed by user with a positive validation; or content reviewed by user with a negative validation” as is recited in Claim 1 (Claims 12, 23 and 34 contain similar limitations). Consequently, the embodiments of the Applicants’ invention as are set forth in Claims 1, 12, 23 and 34 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Alpert et al.

Accordingly, the Applicants also respectfully submit that Alpert et al. does not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as is recited in Claims 2, 4-5 and 11 which depend from Claim 1, Claims 13, 15-16, 22, 35 and 37-38 which depend from Claim 12, Claims 24, 26, 27 and 33 which depend from Claim 23 and Claim 44 which depends from Claim 34. Consequently, these Claims overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

103 Rejections

Claims 3, 6, 8-10, 14, 17, 19-21, 25, 28, 30-32, 36, 39 and 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alpert et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,405,226) in view of Salas et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,233,600). The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as are recited in Claims 3, 6, 8-10, 14, 17, 19-21, 25, 28, 30-32, 36, 39 and 41-43 are neither shown nor suggested by Alpert et al. and Salas et al. either alone or in combination.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 1 which sets forth that an embodiment of the present invention includes a method for user review and validation of content comprising the steps of:

...displaying said content; and displaying an

indication of a state of a user's validation of said content, wherein said state of said user's validation of said content corresponds to: content not reviewed by user, use with caution; or content reviewed by user with a positive validation; or content reviewed by user with a negative validation.

Independent Claims 12, 23 and 34 recite limitations similar to those found in Claim 1. Claims 3, 6, 8-10 depend from Claim 1, Claims 14, 17, 19-20 and 21 depend from Claim 12, Claims 25, 28, 30-32 depend from Claim 23 and Claims 36, 39 and 41-43 depend from Claim 34. These claims recite further features of the claimed invention.

Alpert et al. does not anticipate or render obvious a method for user review and validation of content that includes displaying an indication of the state of a user's validation of the content where the state of the content corresponds to "content not reviewed by user, use with caution; or content reviewed by user with a positive validation; or content reviewed by user with a negative validation" as is recited in Claim 1 (and similar limitations of Claims 12, 23 and 34). In order to meet the aforementioned limitation of Claim 1 a reference must show or suggest, either expressly or inherently, along with the other limitations set forth in the Claims: (1) the display of an indication of a user's validation of content; and (2) an indication of the status of a users review.

The Alpert et al. reference does not show or suggest these claim limitations. Alpert et al. only shows a system and method for taggable digital portfolio creation and report generation. As such, Alpert et al. is primarily concerned with the provision of comments that merely characterize data. Alpert et al. does not teach or suggest that a user positively indicate

whether or not the user has reviewed the content. More specifically, the embodiments of the Applicants' invention as set forth in the Claims 1, 12, 23 and 34 feature user provided validations that not only characterize data ("positive validation", "negative validation" etc.) but also characterize the status of a users' review ("not reviewed", "reviewed") of the data. Moreover, the claims expressly set forth that the characterizations that are made are displayed to the end user. Nowhere in the Alpert reference is there taught or suggested a system or method for user review and validation of content that includes displaying an indication of the state of a user's validation of the content where the state of the validation of the content corresponds to "content not reviewed by user, use with caution; or content reviewed by user with a positive validation; or content reviewed by user with a negative validation" as is recited in Claim 1 (Claims 12, 23 and 34 contain similar limitations). Consequently, the embodiments of the Applicants' invention as set forth in Claims 1, 12, 23 and 34 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Alpert et al.

Salas et al. does not overcome the shortcomings of Alpert et al. noted above. Salas et al. does not anticipate or render obvious a method for user review and validation of content that includes displaying an indication of the status of a user's review and validation of content that includes "content not reviewed by user, use with caution; or content reviewed by user with a positive validation; or content reviewed by user with a negative validation" as is recited in Claim 1 (Claims 12, 23 and 34 contain similar limitations). Salas et al. only shows a method and system for providing a network collaborative work environment. Salas et al. is primarily concerned with providing a network collaborative work environment for servers and client workstations and is not in any way concerned with characterizations of content. By contrast, the Applicants' invention as set forth in the Claims 1, 12, 23 and 34 features validations (as

noted above) that not only characterize data (“positive validation”, “negative validation” etc.) but also characterize the status of a users’ review (“not reviewed”, “reviewed”) of the data. Moreover, the claims expressly set forth that the characterizations that are made of the data and the status of a user’s review are displayed for end user consumption. Nowhere in the Salas et al. reference is there taught or suggested a system or method for user review and validation of content that includes displaying an indication of the state of a user’s validation of the content where the state of the user’s validation of the content corresponds to “content not reviewed by user, use with caution; or content reviewed by user with a positive validation; or content reviewed by user with a negative validation” as is recited in Claim 1 (Claims 12, 23 and 34 contain similar limitations). Consequently, the embodiments of the Applicants’ invention as are set forth in Claims 1, 12, 23 and 34 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Salas et al. and Alpert et al. either alone or in combination.

Accordingly, the Applicants also respectfully submit that Alpert and Salas et al. either alone or in combination do not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the present claimed invention as are recited in Claims 3, 6, 8-10 which depend from Claim 1, Claims 14, 17, 19-20 and 21 which depend from Claim 12, Claims 25, 28, 30-32 which depend from Claim 23 and Claims 36, 39 and 41-43 which depend from Claim 34. Consequently, these claims overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claims 7, 18, 29 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alpert et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,405,226) in view of Jancke et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,764,913). The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that

the embodiments of the present invention as are recited in Claims 7, 18, 29 and 40 are neither shown nor suggested by Alpert et al. and Jancke et al. either alone or in combination.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 1 which sets forth that an embodiment of the present invention includes a method for user review and validation of content comprising the steps of:

...displaying said content; and displaying an indication of a state of a user's validation of said content, wherein said state of said user's validation of said content corresponds to: content not reviewed by user, use with caution; or content reviewed by user with a positive validation; or content reviewed by user with a negative validation.

Independent Claims 12, 23 and 34 recite limitations similar to those found in Claim 1.

Claim 7 depends from Claim 1, Claim 18 depends from Claim 12, Claim 29 depends from Claim 23 and Claim 40 depends from Claim 34. These claims recite further features of the claimed invention.

Alpert et al. does not anticipate or render obvious a method for user review and validation of content that includes displaying an indication of the state of a user's validation of the content where the state of the content corresponds to "content not reviewed by user, use with caution; or content reviewed by user with a positive validation; or content reviewed by user with a negative validation" as is recited in Claim 1 (Claims 12, 23 and 34 contain similar limitations). In order to meet the aforementioned limitation of Claim 1 a reference must show or suggest, either expressly or inherently, along with the other limitations set forth in

the claims: (1) the display of an indication of a user's validation of content; and (2) an indication of the status of a users review.

The Alpert et al. reference does not show or suggest these claim limitations. Alpert et al. only shows a system and method for taggable digital portfolio creation and report generation. As such, Alpert et al. is primarily concerned with the provision of comments that merely characterize data. Alpert et al. does not teach or suggest that a user positively indicate whether or not the user has reviewed the content. More specifically, the embodiments of the Applicants' invention as set forth in the Claims 1, 12, 23 and 34 feature user provided validations that not only characterize data ("positive validation", "negative validation" etc.) but also characterize the status of a users' review ("not reviewed", "reviewed") of the data. Moreover, the claims expressly set forth that the characterizations that are made are displayed to the end user. Nowhere in the Alpert et al. reference is there taught or suggested a system or method for user review and validation of content that includes displaying an indication of the state of a user's validation of the content where the state of the validation of the content corresponds to "content not reviewed by user, use with caution; or content reviewed by user with a positive validation; or content reviewed by user with a negative validation" as is recited in Claim 1 (Claims 12, 23 and 34 contain similar limitations). Consequently, the embodiments of the Applicants' invention as set forth in Claims 1, 12, 23 and 34 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Alpert et al.

Jancke et al. does not overcome the shortcomings of Alpert et al. noted above. Jancke et al. does not anticipate or render obvious a method for user review and validation of content

that includes displaying an indication of the state of a user's validation of the content where the state of the content corresponds to either "content not reviewed by user, use with caution; or content reviewed by user with a positive validation; or content reviewed by user with a negative validation" as is recited in Claim 1 (Claims 12, 23 and 34 contain similar limitations). Jancke et al. only shows a computer network status monitoring system. Jancke et al. is primarily concerned with monitoring the operational state of a plurality of nodes that are located in the network. By contrast, the Applicants' invention as set forth in the Claims 1, 12, 23 and 34 features validations (as noted above) that not only characterize data ("positive validation", "negative validation" etc.) but also characterize the status of a users' review ("not reviewed", "reviewed") of the data. Moreover, the claims expressly set forth that the characterizations that are made of the data and the status of a user's review are displayed for end user consumption. Nowhere in the Jancke et al. reference is there taught or suggested a system or method for user review and validation of content that includes displaying an indication of the state of a user's validation of the content where the state of the user's validation of the content corresponds to "content not reviewed by user, use with caution; or content reviewed by user with a positive validation; or content reviewed by user with a negative validation" as is recited in Claim 1 (Claims 12, 23 and 34 contain similar limitations). Consequently, the embodiments of the Applicants' invention as are set forth in Claims 1, 12, 23 and 34 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Jancke et al. and Alpert et al. either alone or in combination.

Accordingly, the Applicants also respectfully submit that Alpert et al. and Jancke et al. either alone or in combination do not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as is recited in Claim 7 which depends from Claim 1, Claim 18 which depends from Claim 12, Claim 29 depends from Claim 23 and Claim 40 which depends from Claim 34. Consequently, these claims overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Conclusion

In light of the above-listed remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the remaining Claims.

The Examiner is urged to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: 10/4, 2004

Reginald A. Ratliff
Reginald A. Ratliff
Registration No. 48,098
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060